



LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS

3

John Galt
A Charge *Sept 1887.*

DELIVERED TO THE CLERGY

OF THE

Dioocese of **D**urham

NOVEMBER 25, 1886,

BY

J. B. LIGHTFOOT, D.D., D.C L., LL.D.,

BISHOP OF DURHAM

London.

MACMILLAN AND CO.

INDEX.

	PAGE
GENERAL	5
I. THE DIOCESE.	
(1) <i>Church Extension.</i>	
(i) Churches, Chapels, and Parishes	9
(ii) Cemeteries and Churchyards	14
(2) <i>The Services.</i>	
(i) Services in Supplementary Buildings	15
(ii) Holy Communion	15
(iii) Week-day Services	16
(iv) Choirs and Hymns	17
(v) Letting and Appropriation of Pews	17
(3) <i>The Clergy.</i>	
(i) Ordinations	18
(ii) Junior Clergy	19
(iii) Increase in the Clergy	19
(iv) Canon Missioner's Work	20
(4) <i>Lay Ministrations.</i>	
(i) Lay Readers	22
(ii) Lay Evangelists	23
(iii) The Church Army	27
(5) <i>Confirmations</i>	29
(6) <i>Diocesan Finance.</i>	
(i) Financial Statement	31
(ii) Collection of Statistics	32
(iii) General Diocesan Fund	34
(7) <i>Diocesan Societies.</i>	
(i) Church of England Temperance Society	36
(ii) White Cross Army	37
(iii) Girls' Friendly Society	39
(iv) Diocesan Sons of the Clergy	42
(v) Diocesan Board of Inspection	42
(vi) Parochial Schools Society	44
(vii) Diocesan Board of Education	44
(8) <i>Conclusion</i>	45
II THE CHURCH	46
(1) <i>Church Patronage</i>	47
(2) <i>Church Revenues</i>	59
(3) <i>Ecclesiastical Courts</i>	67
(4) <i>The Church House</i>	69
FINAL	70
NOTES	72

A CHARGE.

REVEREND BRETHEREN,

THE very frequent opportunities, which offer themselves to a Bishop in the present day, of communicating his ideas and opinions to the clergy and laity of his Diocese, deprive an episcopal charge of the exclusive importance which attached to it a generation or two ago. It was then practically the sole medium of communication on matters affecting the Diocese and the Church at large. Once every three or four or seven years, as the case might be, the Diocesan put forth his manifesto in the form of a charge; and it stood out prominently from its isolation. In our own age the Church Congresses, the Diocesan Conferences, the frequent public meetings, the gatherings of committees or of societies, exhaust, or almost exhaust, the topics which might otherwise furnish material for a charge. Under these circumstances it might be profitable to take some theological subject of immediate interest or some province of ecclesiastical

history connected with the Diocese, and treat it comprehensively. This, I confess, had been my first thought. But the time is short, and the night is fast approaching, when no man can work. Such treatment, to have any value, would demand far more time and labour than I dare give to it. So far as the direct duties of my office leave me any leisure for the literary work of the Church, I am bound to expend it on other tasks, which have been already laid out for me, and which in all human probability must still remain unfinished at nightfall. Under these circumstances, I shall adopt a less ambitious, but I trust not less useful course to-day. I shall content myself with giving a summary account of the progress made in the Diocese during the four years which have elapsed since the last Visitation, supplementing this account with such remarks as may suggest themselves on the present situation and the special needs of the Church of England, whether in this Diocese or throughout the country.

But I should be guilty of a grave omission, if at the outset I failed to give expression to the deep sense of thanksgiving which must be upmost in the hearts of all to-day, that notwithstanding the exceptional difficulties which have beset our path during this period, the rate of progress will compare favourably with any previous period in the history of the Diocese. The depression of commerce and of agriculture in England has had few parallels in length and intensity. It has touched this county in its

vital parts. To the previous wound inflicted by the state of the coal and iron trade has been added the sudden collapse in shipbuilding, on which the prosperity of all classes in many of our populous towns is largely dependent. Yet notwithstanding all these drawbacks the work has gone steadily forward; new parishes have been formed; churches and mission rooms have risen; the clerical staff has received considerable accessions; lay workers have offered their unpaid services in increasing numbers and with unabated zeal.

One great cause, to which this progress may be ascribed, is the division of the Diocese. At my last Visitation I was able to congratulate you on the recent accomplishment of this desirable measure. On the present occasion I am able to point with joy and thankfulness to its results. The Diocese of Durham has thus been reduced to a manageable size. Not only is the Bishop enabled to exercise a more effective supervision; but the Diocese gains in other ways by the compactness. A sense of corporate unity is at length possible among those who are engaged in diocesan work, and this alone is an inspiration of strength to them. In a recent address a Bishop of another Diocese, advocating the increase of the episcopate, named 250 or 300 as the number of parishes which could be effectively superintended by one man, and therefore as the ideal at which we should aim in the creation of new Sees. If the number of parishes were the only factor in the

solution of this problem, the Diocese of Durham might well be congratulated on the result. The number in this Diocese is lower than the less of these two figures. But there are other serious difficulties with which we have to reckon. In Durham we are confronted with a population which is increasing by rapid strides—a population moreover which is largely migratory. The average population of a parish in the Diocese of Durham is over 4000 at the present moment. This estimate includes the wide tracts of sparsely inhabited country in the upper valleys of the Wear and Tees, as well as in other parts of the county, which tend greatly to diminish the average. This average is five or six or even seven times as great as in some other English Dioceses. The work of a Diocesan under these circumstances is not confined to superintending actual organisations, but consists largely in establishing new. It is a work not of direction, but of creation. Yet the formation of the See of Newcastle has reduced the work within such limits as to bring it within the capacities of one average man. I cannot indeed say that it would be possible for any man, even of superhuman strength and energy, to fulfil the ideal of the episcopal office which is sometimes set forth in print. Whether it would be advisable for a Bishop so far to overshadow the parish clergyman in his own parish as this ideal suggests, I will not stop to enquire. I doubt whether it would be possible for any ordinary man to exert a real influence by direct and frequent personal

ministrations in every parish in his diocese, if he would keep his head clear for supervision in the higher sense. Nevertheless I am thankful to say that there are now only a few churches in my Diocese in which I have not officiated, and I hope before long to complete the circuit. I have preached in all the churches in Gateshead, Darlington, Stockton, and Sunderland (including Bishopwearmouth and Monkwearmouth), and in nearly all in Durham, South Shields, and the Hartlepoons—in the principal churches of these towns several times. But the Bishop's direct ministrations form only a small part of the results which can be traced to the division of the Diocese. We shall see at every turn, in the facts and statistics which I am able to give you, the beneficent effects of the measure.

I.

The Diocese.

1.

*CHURCH EXTENSION.**(i) Churches, Chapels, and Parishes.*

In reviewing the work of the last four years, the first point which will naturally engage our notice is Church Extension. This may be regarded as the distinctive achievement of the period, just as the division of the See had been of the preceding interval from Visitation to Visitation. The exceptional efforts made under my predecessor, resulting in the erection of a very large number of churches as the centres of new parishes, had still left much to be done. All the

arrears bequeathed by previous generations had not been overtaken, and the population was still increasing at the same rapid rate. In my charge four years ago I stated that some extraordinary effort would be necessary before long, and I suggested the creation of a special fund. After a sufficient breathing space, which was needed by the Diocese to recover from the drain upon its resources from the Newcastle Bishopric Fund, the project was taken up in earnest. The public meeting, which inaugurated the movement, was held in January 1884. The appeal met with a prompt and generous response. It was then stated that from 23 to 25 additional churches would be needed to meet the requirements of the growing population, and contributions were solicited for five years. Three years have not yet elapsed since this inaugural meeting, and results have been achieved which must fill all hearts with thankfulness.¹ A sum exceeding £40,000 has been subscribed directly through the fund; and to this must be added nearly the same amount contributed in other ways, either from local subscriptions or in the value of sites or from the grants of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners or of other societies; so that the whole sum collected or promised for the erection of new Churches and Mission Chapels, in connexion with this movement alone, mounts up to £78,000 or £80,000. Already grants have been made to not less than sixteen churches, of which eleven have been actually consecrated and the remaining five are in the course of erection or will

soon be commenced. The beneficent effect of these subsidies has been shown in a remarkable way. Whereas, when this fund was started, several new parishes had been without a church for several years (in one instance not less than thirteen years), at this moment all the parishes formed before the end of 1884, and all but one formed up to the present time, have their churches already erected or in the course of erection; nor is this one likely to remain an exception for many months longer. Judging from past experience, several of these parishes might have waited many years for the erection of their churches and the consequent completion of their parochial machinery. In this respect at all events the arrears have been overtaken. But besides consecrated Churches hardly less useful service has been rendered by this Fund in the supplementary work of aiding the erection of Mission Chapels. Nine such have received grants, including the Seamen's Mission Church at South Shields. It is obvious that Church Extension must take this direction more and more in the future, especially where the area is as limited and the population as large as in the county of Durham. But I am fully persuaded that the policy of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in encouraging the creation of new district parishes has been most beneficial to the spiritual welfare of this diocese hitherto, and I believe that there is still room for a large application of the same principle. I could point at this moment to twenty districts at least where new

parishes might with advantage be formed, if the means were likely to be forthcoming. I do not say that in some cases the alternative principle of working wide districts from a centre through a large staff of curates and numerous chapels of ease or mission rooms may not be preferable. Where there is a well endowed mother Church in a large town, and where therefore we may expect always to find as Rector or Vicar an exceptionally competent man, whose reputation will gather zealous and able young men about him, this arrangement may be the best for the working of the parish itself, while it will serve as a valuable training ground for the rising clergy. But it would in my opinion be a serious mistake to extend this principle of arrangement widely, and there is little room for it in this Diocese. In the first place, looking beyond the limits of the parish and of the immediate present to the future of the Church at large, it is surely most unadvisable to multiply the number of curates without increasing to any appreciable extent the independent positions to which they may aspire to succeed. Then again the responsibilities and the opportunities of an independent charge bring out the latent power of a man as nothing else will. If he is only made of the right stuff and has received a sufficient training in a subordinate position, his pastoral and administrative capacities suddenly develop in a marvellous way. I speak of that which I have witnessed again and again, indeed I have come to regard it as a spiritual law and

to expect it, and I have rarely been disappointed. The place makes the man, where there is the making in him. Then again the division of the parish plants the clergyman in the heart of his people and identifies him with them. This advantage indeed is purchased at the cost of isolation from other society which is valuable to him; but it is worth the price.

In few parts of England has the division of parishes gone on so rapidly as in this Diocese. The number of benefices in the county of Durham in March 1827 was only 79; it is now 234. It has thus increased nearly three-fold in less than 60 years. The great accession to the number was made during the long episcopate of my predecessor, when not less than 82 new parishes were created in Durham. His own zeal and business capacity, the opening of the then unworked mine of local claims, and the years of unexampled prosperity in the county, all conspired to produce this happy result. In his last words to the Diocese he expressed his belief that this form of Church Extension had nearly reached its limit. This surmise however has not been verified. The movement has gone forward with scarcely diminished speed. Since my last Visitation fourteen new parishes have been formed in the Diocese of Durham, and three or four more are in the process of formation; but much still remains to be done. The difficulty however has been increased of late, not only by the depression of the times, but by the more exacting demands of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners as to the size of the churches and in

some cases by the diminished scale of their contributions.

To complete this review of the progress of Church Extension, I should add that since the last Visitation sixteen Parish Churches have been consecrated besides the Chapel at Sedgefield Asylum. Of the whole number of Mission Chapels and other buildings where service is held, which have been finished and opened during this period, I am not able to give precise statistics; but it has been very large—much larger, I suspect, than in any previous quadriennial period.²

(ii) *Cemeteries and Churchyards.*

This is a convenient place likewise to speak about the consecration of Cemeteries and Churchyards. When the Act of 1880 was passed, I resolved to continue the consecration of burial grounds as before, wherever I received an invitation from the proper authorities. I saw no reason for doing otherwise, and I had satisfied myself that I should be acting in accordance with the vastly preponderating feeling of the clergy and laity of the diocese. There was not a word in the Consecration Service which required changing to adapt it to the altered condition of things; and it seemed to me that a very real wound would be inflicted on Christian sentiment by discontinuing this eminently pious use. I am thankful to say that I did not miscalculate the prevailing sentiment. The applications to me to consecrate burial grounds have been even more frequent since

the passing of the Act than before. Besides the graveyards attached to and consecrated with newly erected churches, I have since the last Visitation consecrated 19 cemeteries or additions to cemeteries or to churchyards.³

2. *THE SERVICES.*

(i) *Services in Supplementary Buildings.*

It is a natural transition from the buildings to the services held within their walls. So far as I can learn from the answers to the Visitation questions, regular services, weekly or oftener, in connexion with the Church of England (exclusive of cottage lectures) are held in not less than 186 buildings, Chapels of Ease, Mission Chapels, School Rooms, etc., throughout the Diocese, besides the Parish Churches. This gives an average of about four for every five parishes; and the reckoning probably understates the fact.

(ii) *Holy Communion.*

Of the 234 parishes, which make up the Diocese, Holy Communion is celebrated weekly or oftener in 105 (there being at least two celebrations every week in 20 of these), fortnightly or oftener but not as often as once a week in 59, monthly or oftener but not as often as once a fortnight in 67; while there are three only in which the intervals are longer. It is a matter of interest to compare these numbers with the statistics of a little more than seventy years ago, taken from the Visitation returns made to Bishop Barrington in 1814. As a rule, the Holy Communion

was then celebrated in the churches of this Diocese four times in the year with occasional variations on either side of five times or three times. Very rarely was there a monthly celebration, and in no case a weekly. Of the parishes in the county of Durham which send in returns, only 22 had a monthly celebration, with sometimes the addition of the three or four great festivals. We may be thankful for the advance; but we still fall far short of the primitive standard. In the earliest ages the Holy Communion was weekly in every congregation. It was the one essential feature in the Sunday services. On this point our information is explicit, and it carries us back to the confines of the Apostolic age.

(iii) *Week-day Services.*

The statistics of the Services on Week-days, as gathered from the Visitation returns, are as follows :

1. Parishes where morning and evening prayer are said daily	} 30
2. Parishes where morning or evening prayer is said daily... ..	} 33
3. Parishes where at least one week-day service is held in the church throughout the year	} 89
4. Parishes where week-day services are held during some portions of the year (as Lent and Advent)	} 58
5. Parishes where the only week-day services are on the great festivals	} 24

(iv) Choirs and Hymns.

I pass on to matters of subordinate interest, which however are not without their importance. Of Choirs in Churches and consecrated Chapels, as many as 118 out of 246 are surpliced. In this respect the change has been great within the last few years. While I must express my own conviction that this distinctive dress tends to seemliness and order in the members, that it is a valuable suggestion to them of their responsibility as leaders of the congregational singing, and that in all ways it promotes greater reverence, yet I do not consider it so important that I desire to see it introduced where it is seriously objected to by any large number of the congregation or where it is likely to occasion strife. A question was likewise asked in the Visitation paper about the Hymn Books used throughout the Diocese. I find that Hymns Ancient and Modern are used in 152 parishes, the Hymnal Companion in 44, Church Hymns in 34, and various other collections in the remaining four.

(v) Letting and Appropriation of Pews.

Pew rents in this Diocese are a very rare exception. Of all the parish churches there are only 12 in which any seats are let, only two in which more than half the seats are let. Appropriation also is exceptional. Only 45 are returned as appropriating seats; and in several of these cases the seats appropriated are so few that the churches may be regarded as practically open.

3. *THE CLERGY.*(i) *Ordinations.*

The next subject which naturally suggests itself is the Clergy ; and here the statistics of the Ordinations are of primary interest. Nothing more directly concerns the well being of the Diocese than the number and character of its clerical recruits. I am thankful to say that the advance which I noted at my last Visitation has been maintained during the past few years. The numbers ordained to the diaconate in the three preceding quadriennial periods, when the Diocese was still undivided, were 90, 119, and 134 respectively. During the last four years 115 deacons have been ordained for the present reduced Diocese. Meanwhile the largely increased proportion of candidates from the older Universities, to which I called attention at my last Visitation, has been more than maintained. Whereas they had then mounted up to a little more than half, the proportion is now slightly over three-fifths of the whole number. At the same time there has been no falling off in candidates from Durham University. The number of Durham men remains as before, about one-fourth of the whole ; but among the Durham men themselves the proportion of graduates to others has largely increased, being now 11 to 17, as compared with 8 to 26. The whole number of deacons from all Universities together is 101 out of 115. The residue is composed of 13 members of Theological Colleges, and one literate.⁴ But the number of candidates ordained is not the only

element to be considered. This must vary more or less according to the vacancies. I am glad to say that in these later years the vacancies in the curacies of this Diocese at any given time have been decidedly fewer than during the previous quadriennial period.

(ii) *Junior Clergy.*

While I am speaking of the younger clergy, I may say it has been a true pleasure to me to welcome the curates for the annual gathering at Auckland Castle, and that I have heard from time to time with satisfaction of the meetings of the Junior Clerical Society, as well for devotional purposes as for discussion of questions affecting their ministerial duties, believing that such opportunities of interchanging ideas and sympathies must be a real advantage to them and to their work.

(iii) *Increase in the Clergy.*

The number of curates has increased from 163 to 193 during the four years. The increase would have been larger, if the Ecclesiastical Commissioners had seen their way to making grants for curates with the same liberality and promptness in the recently formed parishes as heretofore. But they have pleaded the state of their funds, and it is deeply to be regretted that populous town parishes and large pit villages, containing many thousands of people, are left to the unaided ministrations of the incumbent, notwithstanding the local claims which they can urge. I trust that in these cases the much needed grants will not be long

delayed. Of the increase in the ranks of incumbents I need add nothing. It is regulated by the number of benefices, of which I have already spoken. It is a satisfaction to note that, when the Visitation returns were made, of the 234 incumbents in the Diocese only three were non-resident. These three were disabled by age or infirmity, and their parishes were administered by curates in charge. In Bishop Barrington's returns for 1814, from which I have already drawn illustrations, it appears that, while the whole number of incumbents in Durham was a little more than a third of the present number, one half of these were pluralists, holding other preferment in this or other dioceses, and therefore resident on an average only half their time at most. Altogether there has been an increase of from 45 to 50 working clergy during the last four years.

(iv) *Canon Missioner's Work.*

The period since the last Visitation has been marked by one other development in the spiritual work of the Diocese which deserves to be mentioned here, while I am speaking of the clergy. In my last charge I dwelt on the desirableness of securing the services of a Canon Missioner, who should visit the different parishes, as occasion served, should direct or conduct missions from time to time, and should in other ways stimulate the spiritual energies of the Diocese. I am thankful to add that not many months after these words were spoken I was able to make such an appointment, with what advantage to

the Diocese I need not say. The Canon Missioner has now been working among us for three years or more. How widely his presence has been felt throughout the Diocese, you yourselves will be able to testify. Three general missions have been held in three of our most populous centres, Gateshead, Jarrow, and South Shields, under the superintendence and with the personal co-operation of the Canon Missioner. Besides these more comprehensive efforts, there have been missions in a number of individual parishes in town and country. Altogether either by an occasional sermon or address, or in more sustained efforts, the Canon Missioner has now ministered in not less than 142 Churches in the Diocese. Moreover permanent Mission Stations have been instituted in three parishes under laymen for whose maintenance he is responsible ; and a band of Mission Ladies, at present twelve in number, has been organized by him, who have nursed the small-pox patients and are now engaged in parish work in several populous centres in the Diocese. Meanwhile the spiritual life of the workers themselves has not been neglected. 'Quiet days' have been held for the Clergy and others from time to time.

When in my last charge I indicated the appointment of a Canon Missioner, I likewise drew a picture of a band of mission preachers gathered about him. How far this picture has been realized, the statement which I have just made will enable you to judge. But besides this a certain number of the younger clergy

are educating themselves to take part in missions. I rejoice in this. The occasional undertaking of such evangelistic work outside their own immediate charge will re-act advantageously on their parochial ministrations; but it should only be very occasional. They will remember that their first duty is to their own flock.

The work of the Canon Missioner has been valuable in another way. It is a fresh illustration of the real importance to the Church of endowed Canonries. I could never consent to regard the Canonries at Durham as appendages to some parochial or other ecclesiastical charge, or as mere places of dignified ease. The Canons of Durham, one and all, I thankfully acknowledge, recognize the true conception of a Canonry, as furnishing full employment in itself for a man's energies. Where their time is not given to the University, it is given to the Diocese. A sensible loss would be incurred by the withdrawal of any one from the general diocesan work. There are not in my opinion too many, but too few such posts in the Church, provided only their ideal is duly realized.

4. *LAY MINISTRATIONS.*

(i) *Lay Readers.*

Next in importance to the work of the clergy are the lay ministrations. In my former charge I spoke at length about the office of Lay Reader, of which I entertained great hopes for the spiritual progress of

the Diocese. At the present moment 55 lay readers are working in the Diocese, and they are distributed through 29 parishes. I do not doubt that they have done good service in their respective neighbourhoods; but I may confess to a little disappointment that the institution has not taken root more deeply and spread more widely. I am well aware of the difficulty of finding suitable men, especially where they are most wanted; but it would seem to be a wise economy in the long run, even for over-worked clergy, to devote some of their time to training laymen, who may themselves become teachers in turn, and thus help them to bear a burden, which must be too heavy for them without such relief. I am glad to report that, notwithstanding the great distance, a few of our lay readers have found themselves able to avail themselves of the advantages of instruction intellectual and spiritual, which are offered at Oxford during the Long Vacation.

(ii) *Lay Evangelists.*

But this institution of Lay Readers, though it has done good service already and may be expected to prove still more fruitful when fully developed, can hardly be expected to supply all the exigencies of the case. The parish which most needs such lay agents to supplement the spiritual work of the clergy is often least able to supply them. It is necessary therefore to look outside the parish. This necessity has led during the present year to a new departure

in this Diocese—the creation of the office of Lay Evangelist. The unit here is not the Parish, but the Rural Deanery. Nearly a year ago I was consulted as to the practicability of instituting an order of itinerant lay preachers who should go about and take services in neglected parts of our great towns and outlying hamlets, either in mission rooms or in the open air. The movement arose simultaneously in two separate Rural Deaneries, Auckland and Wearmouth. It was further commended to me by the fact that the initiative was taken by the laymen themselves, who were in some cases working men. Some of these were already doing evangelistic work, but they desired to carry it on under proper authority and on an organized plan; others were eager to offer their spare time to the Master's service, but they felt that they needed training to render their ministrations efficient. A meeting of those interested in this movement was held in Sunderland, at which I presided. I was deeply impressed by the earnestness and sobriety of tone which marked the speakers; and I felt that I should incur a grave responsibility if I did not do all in my power to encourage a movement which seemed to be the prompting of the Holy Spirit and which held out hope of so much spiritual usefulness. Accordingly at my suggestion rules were drawn up and submitted to me by the two Rural Deaneries after mutual consultation; and having received my assent, they were published in the March number of the Diocesan Magazine. The

advantage of taking the Rural Deanery rather than the Parish as the limit is threefold. It is thus possible to supply the needs of the less favoured districts from the more favoured. The town will furnish the evangelist for the hamlet; the more educated part of the town for the less educated. Then again systematic instruction of the preachers becomes more feasible, where they are thus aggregated. Lastly; as they do not minister from one year's end to the other in the same spot, but move about from place to place, the burden of preparation is lightened—an important consideration with men busily occupied during the week—while their work gains in freshness and efficiency. But your evangelist, it may be said, bears a strong likeness to the Wesleyan local preacher. I am not ashamed of the resemblance. I freely confess my admiration of the marvellous capacity of organization which distinguished John Wesley and which he has bequeathed to his followers. The truest Churchmen are those whose minds are most open to the lessons which can be gathered from all quarters. I believe that the Church of England has a greater power of utilizing the evangelistic zeal of her lay members than any other Christian community, though hitherto it has been latent. Certainly this ought to be the case, for the sense of corporate unity with her, if she is true to her principles, is built upon a stronger and deeper foundation than accidental association for religious purposes. Most assuredly she will be wise to find employment for this zeal: for an

untold mine of missionary power is here, which alone can cope with the spiritual destitution ; and, if neglected by her, this noble passion for Christ will seek relief for its yearnings in other channels. Most earnestly therefore do I recommend this movement. It has already had a sufficient trial in this diocese to inspire bright hopes for the future. The regulations contemplate two orders, Evangelists and Assistant Evangelists or Probationers. A member of the second order is not received into the first except after due examination by persons approved by the Bishop. Lectures are given in the Scriptures, in the Prayer Book, in the Articles and Catechism, in Church History, to prepare them for their work. In each Rural Deanery there is a Committee composed in nearly equal numbers of clergy and laymen, and presided over by the Rural Dean. This Committee satisfies itself of the moral and spiritual fitness of the candidates before presenting them to the Bishop ; it provides for the delivery of courses of lectures to those who are preparing for the work ; and it arranges the rota of the times and places where the Evangelists and Assistant Evangelists are to hold services with the consent of the clergy of the several parishes. In May last I admitted the first band of Lay Evangelists for the Auckland Deanery in my own Chapel, six in number. They are aided by seven assistants. These men have now been at work for six months, and the result has been beneficial in many ways. It has been a

great relief to over-worked clergy ; it has enabled them to occupy places which had been hitherto untouched or barely touched ; it has set the spiritual capacities of the Church before the people in a very definite way ; and it has opened out an avenue for the zeal of rising Churchmen. Last month again I set apart in the presence of a large congregation in the old Parish Church of Bishopwearmouth seven other Evangelists—the first band for that Deanery. It is too early to speak of achievements in this case. But from the spirit of calm earnestness, which has characterized the movement throughout in the Wearmouth Deanery, I augur equally happy results. I trust that the movement may spread to other parts of the Diocese. This Diocese, if I mistake not, is exceptionally favourable for such an effort. The population is sufficiently distributed in hamlets to need it, and yet sufficiently concentrated to make it possible. The latent spiritual power is there, I am persuaded, if we can only elicit and train and guide it.⁵

(iii) *The Church Army.*

One other development of lay ministrations well deserves attention. In my former charge I spoke at length of the Salvation Army. While regretting the extravagances and pointing out the dangerous features in the movement, I seemed to myself to see in it valuable lessons which the Church might with advantage appropriate. Since that time an institution

has come, if not into being, at least into prominence, which is worked altogether on Church lines, and furnishes the very organization that we seem to want. I refer of course to the Church Army. The Church Army has now been tried in several parishes in this Diocese; and I gratefully acknowledge the beneficial results. I do not put it forward as a universal specific for spiritual destitution. There are some parishes where it would be altogether out of place. There are others which do not need it, having already machinery for doing the same work. Moreover it is absolutely necessary that the incumbent should place himself at the head, so as to direct and control its operations. The fastidiousness which shrinks from methods perfectly legitimate in themselves but not commending themselves to refined taste must be resolutely overcome. An army without a commander is a gross anomaly. But under the proper conditions the Church Army may prove a very real blessing to many a district. I take as examples the two parishes in this Diocese where it was first introduced, and in which it has had the longest and fairest trial, the Ven. Bede's, Monkwearmouth, and S. John's, Sunderland. I cannot for a moment doubt—the confirmations are visible proof—that in these parishes it has effected what no existing parochial organization could have effected; it has dragged numbers of men and women out of the gutter, has expelled the demon of drink or of some other gross vice, and has seated them clothed and in their right mind at the feet of Christ. Of one thing

I am sure, no incumbent need be apprehensive as to the loyalty of the officers. Loyalty is a fundamental principle in the Church Army.⁶

5. CONFIRMATIONS.

No province of a Bishop's work has a more lively interest for him than his Confirmations. He watches anxiously to see the results of each year's list, believing that, though it may fail as a test in individual cases, yet if a sufficiently wide area be taken it is a very fair index of the progress of the pastoral work of the diocese. I am thankful to say that the statistics are most encouraging. At my last Visitation in 1882 I was able to report that there had been an increase of not less than 45 per cent. during the four years, as compared with the same period immediately preceding. This surprising increase has even been exceeded in the interval between the last Visitation and the present. The advance upon the statistics of 1882, taking the two Counties of Northumberland and Durham together, is over 46 per cent. Thus it happens that the number confirmed in the same quadriennial period within the area of the undivided Diocese of Durham has considerably more than doubled since the commencement of my episcopate. In the years 1875—1878 inclusive it was 17,502; in the years 1879—1882 it rose to 25,815; and in the years 1883—1886 it has mounted up to 37,132. I should add that if, withdrawing Northumberland, we consider the present diocese of Durham alone, the

progress has been at least as great. In the present year I have confirmed over 7,700 persons, a number much larger than in any previous year since the division of the Diocese, and exceeded only on one occasion even in the undivided Diocese—the first year of my episcopate when owing to exceptional reasons there were exceptional numbers. Even after making proper allowance for the increase in the population this is a noteworthy fact. I attribute this rapid and yet steady increase in the numbers largely to the multiplication of centres rendered possible by the division of the Diocese, but still more to the increased zeal of the clergy and the growing efficiency of parochial ministrations. But we ought not to rest satisfied with these results. It is almost impossible indeed that the same rapid rate of progress can be maintained in the years to come; but we still fall considerably below the percentage of the whole population which is attained in other Dioceses, where the proportion of Nonconformists is much less. I see one way indeed, by which our numbers might be swelled at once; but I cannot recommend it. By lowering the age we should attain this end, for unquestionably young children will present themselves for Confirmation more freely than growing youths. But after consultation with clergy of wide experience and of divers schools, I see no reason to modify the advice which I have hitherto given. There may be exceptional cases, whether of individuals or of whole classes, where circumstances render it

advisable to present candidates at an earlier age, but as a rule fifteen seems to me the best standard. It is one thing to secure a lad for Confirmation, and quite another to retain a hold over him when confirmed. The season of Confirmation is the one opportunity for the clergyman in the lives of most young persons, and this opportunity cannot be anticipated and exhausted prematurely without serious loss. But I have never wished to dictate upon this point, and having expressed my own opinion I am content to leave it to the discretion of the parochial clergy themselves, as directly responsible for the welfare of their people. I would only add that it is impossible to exaggerate the magnitude of the opportunity, and that no pastoral work is more spiritually remunerative than the labour bestowed on gathering together and preparing candidates for Confirmation. It touches, or it may be made to touch, not the individual children only, but their parents and their homes.⁷

6. *DIOCESAN FINANCE.*

(i) *Financial Statement.*

In nothing has the wisdom of dividing the See been more conspicuously vindicated than in its financial results. This will have appeared already in my statement respecting the Church Building Fund: but it is still more strikingly emphasized, when we reckon up the expenditure from all sources on various Church works in the Diocese. The amounts ex-

pended since the last Visitation, as given by the returns, are as follows :—

	£
1. For sites and erection of new Churches ...	66,302
2. For repairs, enlargement, and decoration of existing Churches	60,682
3. For Churchyards and other burial places in connexion with the Church	9,935
4. For Parsonages.....	27,416
5. For Church Schools (Day and Sunday); sites, erection, enlargement, repair, or furnishing	39,516
6. For Mission Rooms, Church Institutes, and other buildings not included under the previous heads.....	19,874
	<hr/>
Total.....	£223,725
	<hr/> <hr/>

The amounts under these heads are generally larger, and in some cases far larger, than they were for the undivided Diocese during the four previous years. If to these we add the large sums contributed in the Diocese of Newcastle during the same period, it will be plain that the money spent on the foundation of the new See has been far more than recouped to the two Dioceses already.⁸

(ii) *Collection of Statistics.*

ould add that special pains have been taken at
ent Visitation to get full and accurate returns.

If the steps taken for this purpose have seemed vexatious to any of the clergy, I can only plead the importance of the results. The meagre and inadequate returns for instance, which have been furnished from this Diocese to the Official Year Book of the Church during the last two or three years, when they did not pass through the hands of the Bishop or of any central diocesan authority, were misleading and tended to discredit the Diocese.

While I am speaking on this subject, there is another point to which it may be well to advert. In the Official Year Book all grants from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners are excluded; and it would perhaps be difficult there to deal with the matter in any other way. Yet the Diocese of Durham suffers by this mode of computation. In Durham the Ecclesiastical Commissioners are the chief owners of property; in some parishes they are almost the only owners on a large scale. What they give to the Diocese (with some inconsiderable exceptions), they give in virtue of local claims, as owners of property in Durham, not as Commissioners for England. They return to Durham only a portion of the great wealth which they draw from Durham. A double injustice therefore is done to the Diocese by omitting their grants in the reckoning. While itself contributing very large sums annually to the spiritual needs of the rest of England, Durham is not even credited with the contributions of its own chief owners of property.

(iii) General Diocesan Fund.

Before we leave the question of finance, there is another matter to which I invite your attention. It was resolved by the Diocesan Conference to establish a general Diocesan Fund. A committee has since been formed, and regulations have been drawn up. The fund will consist of two parts, appropriated and unappropriated. Through the former contributions will be received for existing diocesan institutions, such as the Church Building Society, the Sons of the Clergy, the Schools Fund, and the like. The latter will be devoted to diocesan purposes generally. Whenever any of these existing institutions are in difficulties, or when it is desirable to increase their resources, it will be competent for the committee to make grants to them. But its principal use will be to provide for cases, for which at present no provision is made. Any one conversant with the special needs of this Diocese will know how important it is to have such a fund, at once flexible in its destination and adequate in its resources, and how seriously the work of the Diocese is crippled at various points for the want of it. A mission curate needs to be placed without delay in a newly inhabited or rapidly growing district; a mission room is an immediate want; a site for a permanent church must be secured in time. Promptness is everything. The prospect for the future depends on the spiritual provision keeping pace with the increase of the population. Arrears

accumulated at the first will take years to overtake, even if they are ever overtaken. Then again this Fund may be the instrument of increasing the endowment of small livings or of building parsonages in poor districts, where it is properly met by benefactions from without. There are various other miscellaneous expenses also, which at present we meet as best we can, but which would naturally fall upon it. We ought to aim at raising a sum of £5000 or £6000 annually through this fund to meet all our wants. Similar funds have been established in other dioceses with the most beneficent effects. It is proposed to have a Diocesan Sunday on which collections shall be made in all churches throughout the Diocese for this fund. I trust that the clergy and their congregations will regard this as a first charge on their liberality. To the poorer neighbourhoods it will directly appeal, for they will hope to be the chief recipients, and they cannot reasonably expect any aid if they have shown no sympathy; while the richer neighbourhoods will remember the fundamental principle of the Gospel, that from those to whom much has been given much will be required. In some other Dioceses a sum amounting to £1500 or £2000 has been raised on Diocesan Sunday; and, though the parishes are much fewer in this Diocese, I do not see why Durham should fall far short of this amount. The day selected is Whit-Sunday. We shall thus be reminded that, while we are bound to

provide the material resources, yet these are nothing in themselves, and the Spirit alone can vivify.⁹

7. *DIOCESAN SOCIETIES*

The Diocesan Societies have in most cases been re-organized since the last Visitation, owing to the division of the Diocese. Though the period of transition was a time of trial and anxiety in some instances, yet the records show that the progress has been real since the re-organization, and that they have reaped their full share of the benefits conferred upon the Diocese at large by the creation of the new Sec. I shall content myself here with singling out those societies which call for remark.

(i) *Church of England Temperance Society.*

A comparison of the statistics of the year ending October 1882 and October 1886 respectively exhibits the measure of progress since the last Visitation. The statistics given for the former date are confined to the County of Durham alone, being extracted from the report of the still undivided Diocese.

The number of members enrolled at the two epochs were as follows :—

YEARS.	GENERAL SECTION.	ABSTAINERS.	JUVENILE.	TOTAL.
1882	794	4,730	4,838	10,362
1886	1,015	22,062	21,890	44,967

It should be added that during the last year not less than 10,258 members were enrolled—a number nearly equal to the total recorded number of members in 1882. Allowance however should be made for the fact that the report of 1882 was very imperfect, as likewise in many cases for the possible enrolment of the same members more than once owing to change of locality or other causes. Yet after every reasonable deduction made on these grounds, the increase is marked. The further statistics given in the following table tell their own tale :—

YEARS.	ASSOCIATIONS.	BANDS OF HOPE.	TOTAL.	PARISHES.	OFFERTORIES.	CONTRIBUTIONS OF SOCIETIES.
					£ s. d.	£ s. d.
1882	46	39	85	42	63 4 3½	23 1 0
1886	89	100	189	115	85 17 7	36 3 7

The society is solvent; and, if only proper exertions are made, its financial condition need not cause any anxiety in the future.

(ii) *White Cross Army.*

The *White Cross Movement* is subsequent to the last Visitation. This is therefore the first occasion when it has been mentioned by me in a charge; but I have lost no opportunity meanwhile of urging it on the attention of the Diocese as a primary duty of the Church of Christ. The first enrolment of members in the *White Cross Army* was at Bishop Auckland in February 1883, when a parochial organization was formed. Shortly after this it extended to other parts

of the Diocese, and in February 1884 the Diocesan Association was enrolled as one of the earliest branches of the Church of England Purity Society, which had been started meanwhile. Steps have been taken from time to time to keep the subject before the minds of the clergy and others interested in the moral and spiritual welfare of the Diocese. Besides meetings held from time to time in different populous centres, valuable papers were read and addresses delivered on the subject at the general Diocesan Conference in October 1885; and a special Conference of the Clergy, summoned to consider the prospects of the movement in December of the same year, was largely attended. There are now nine parochial associations actively at work; but this does not measure the extent of the results attained. I have reason to believe that in many parishes, where no special organization has been created, the clergy have devoted more attention to this foul canker which, if unheeded, must corrupt and drain the life of any Church or nation. But though some little has been accomplished, very far more remains to be done. And meanwhile the stimulus of a noble and energetic rivalry is applied to our sluggishness.

For the spark struck in the Diocese of Durham has kindled a flame which is spreading far and wide. Not only in Great Britain and Ireland, not only in our own dependencies and colonies across the sea, has the cause been eagerly taken up. The latest and most striking development of the movement has been

witnessed in the United States. At the Convention of the American Episcopal Church, held recently at Chicago, a resolution was carried unanimously to the effect that 'this meeting has heard with great satisfaction the statement of the origin and principles of the White Cross Movement and heartily concurs in the proposition to form a Central Committee for counsel and co-operation in connexion with the work now being carried on for the promotion of a higher standard of morality.' It has thus been taken up by the American Church, as a Church. Must we not feel this extension of a movement which was inaugurated in this Diocese, as a fresh burden of responsibility laid upon us? Would it not be an everlasting reproach to us, if having preached this crusade to others we ourselves should be found laggards or poltroons in the day of battle.

(iii) *Girls' Friendly Society.*

The progress in the work of this Society has been satisfactory, as the following table, commencing with the first year after the division of the Diocese, will show.

YEARS.	BRANCHES.	ASSOCIATES	MEMBERS.	CANDIDATES
1883	7	223	1,282	
1884	7	239	1,365	85
1885	12	310	1,505	120
1886	12	363	1,817	354

But, though there has been real progress, here also much still remains to be done. While it is worked with great zeal and efficiency in some parts of the Diocese, it is wholly unrepresented elsewhere. Its organization hitherto has reached only 67 parishes out of 234. In other words considerably more than two-thirds of the parishes in the populous county of Durham are untouched by its beneficent agency. I wish I could think that its place was supplied in these districts by some other similar association which was doing the same work, though not on quite the same lines, but I cannot find that this is the case. I am well aware that in some neighbourhoods difficulties have been found in carrying out its rules honestly. I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that in all neighbourhoods the honest working of these rules must exclude many girls and young women, whom as Christians we are bound to regard with especial compassion. But the fact remains that this association is doing a great and beneficent work among large classes; that in its wide ramifications it spreads like a net-work not only over the whole of England but among English-speaking people in far-off continents; that this very dissemination is a main element in its usefulness, because it is thus enabled to keep an eye upon those who are once committed to its charge, though their homes may be changed; and that thus every additional parish, which admits its organization, not only receives direct benefit in itself, but likewise contributes to the general efficiency of the

association as a whole, because it is a further approach towards the completeness of the dissemination. Most earnestly therefore do I plead for the admission of this society into those parishes of my Diocese where the ground is still unoccupied. It were a narrow and mistaken policy to reject the valuable aid of this society, because it fails to cover all the ground and to fulfil every demand which the Christian conscience recognizes.

One important step has been taken recently, which tends greatly to increase its efficiency. A Girls' Friendly Society Training Home has been established at Stockton, which I trust will receive the cordial support of the Diocese at large. A small cottage was opened as a home at Sunderland more than three years ago; but at the expiration of the lease this institution was transferred to Stockton, where a small house was taken in January of the present year. From this temporary abode it has recently migrated to a more commodious house in the same town, which has been formally opened and may be regarded as its permanent quarters. This Diocesan Training Home serves a two-fold purpose. It receives as boarders young ladies, pupil teachers, and others, thus providing a comfortable home for them at a most trying period of their lives; and it gives facilities for teaching every branch of domestic work to girls intended for service. I should add that one room in the house is reserved as a recreation room for young women in business. It would be well if such

recreation rooms could be provided on an extensive scale in all our large towns.

(iv) *Diocesan Sons of the Clergy.*

I have only to urge once more, as I did in my former charge, the claims of this excellent Society, which assists the widows and orphans of the needy clergy. Funds are sorely needed to sustain its operations. On all classes alike the duty of providing means for this purpose is laid. The poorer clergy, whether curates or incumbents, ought to contribute—however small their contributions—to a fund from which they look forward to deriving advantage hereafter in the person of their families. The more highly endowed clergy are bound to show sympathy with the struggling members of their own class. And above all, the laity ought to value the privilege of contributing in this way to the resources of a Church, which through its endowments is enabled to offer them its ministrations gratuitously and thus makes comparatively few demands on their liberality.

(v) *Diocesan Board of Inspection.*

The *Diocesan Board of Inspection* acts for the combined dioceses of Durham and Newcastle till the end of the year 1886, when it ceases to exist and the work is taken over by new organizations in the respective dioceses. The following tables show that the progress recorded in my former charge has still been maintained in the interval, in all respects except

in the number of pupil teachers examined. In this latter respect the numbers culminated in 1881; there was a very marked decrease in the two following years; and the numbers have fallen, though not to any great extent, since.

YEARS	SCHOOLS INSPECTED	CHILDREN EXAMINED.	PUPIL TEACHERS EXAMINED.
1877	469	45,831	587
1881	494	56,788	658
1885	540	65,933	499

The above table gives the progress in the *amount* of the work done by this Board. The improvement in the *quality* will appear from the following table;

YEARS.	EXCELLENT.	GOOD.	FAIR.	MODERATE	INDIFFERENT.	BAD.
1877	17	254	157	32	2	7
1881	35	284	156	17	2	0
1885	42	333	148	10	1	1

In the year 1886 there has been a further increase. The number of children examined in religious knowledge during the year has been 68,324, which exceeds the daily average attendance of the children in these schools by 6,130—a satisfactory assurance, as the Report says, that “parents and children alike value the religious instruction given and tested in these schools.”

(vi) Parochial Schools Society.

After a long and useful career this Society has expired. Its seventy-fourth and final annual Report was issued in October. Its work will be taken over by the organization which I shall mention next in order.

(vii) Diocesan Board of Education.

The advisability of forming a general *Diocesan Board of Education* has been under consideration for some time ; and a constitution for such a Board was framed at the meeting of the Diocesan Conference in February last. The elections took place in accordance with this scheme ; and the Board has now commenced its work. I look forward with great hopefulness to the benefits which the Diocese will reap from this new institution. An account of its constitution, of the result of the elections, and of the principles and rules which it has laid down for its future guidance, will be found in the first number of the *Diocesan Gazette*. I cannot refrain from expressing my satisfaction that it counts among its members an adequate representation of the schoolmasters themselves. Great advantage has already resulted from their counsels and co-operation.

This Board has taken over the work of the old *Board of Inspection* and will conduct it on the same principles as heretofore. It has likewise been charged with the administration of the funds which have hitherto been dispensed by the *Parochial Schools*

Society. But obviously the operations of the new Board will be much wider and more comprehensive than those compassed by the two older associations now dissolved. The condition of several of our Church Schools in the Diocese is a cause of grave anxiety; and timely advice and assistance may save such from financial ruin in the future. Arrangements have been made for a friendly inspection of such schools, where it is invited by the managers, with a view to suggesting such improvements as may secure a more efficient and economical working. Then again the whole question of the instruction given in Sunday Schools needs careful consideration. It is felt by many that some systematic course of instruction in the Sunday Schools is a great desideratum, and that the inadequacy of the results hitherto attained, where so much labour is expended on our Sunday School teaching, is largely due to this absence of system. Here is a wide and important field for the operations of the Board. And again, the very large subject of secondary education, which hitherto has been hardly touched, might well engage its attention. These are a few out of many points in which a central authority, charged with the responsibility of watching the education, more especially the religious education, of the Diocese, may render great service.

CONCLUSION.

It is time now for me to turn from the Diocese to the wider interests of the Church at large. But,

before parting from this branch of my subject, I would select two points in the foregoing statement for special emphasis—the Central Diocesan Fund as providing the sinews of war, and the Lay Evangelist movement as recruiting the ranks of our soldiers. I commend both these to your special prayers and your earnest efforts, and I trust that if we are spared—you and I—to another Visitation, we may be able to give a good account to the Master of these talents which He has entrusted to our keeping.

II.

The Church.

It will hardly be expected that I should again discuss the recent attack on the establishment and endowments of the Church. I spoke to you at some length last year, when the attack was made, and I see no reason to retract or modify any opinion then expressed. Further experience only intensifies my conviction of the disastrous consequences to the spiritual work of the Church, and therefore to the spiritual condition of the nation, which would ensue from such a measure. But the attack itself has not been without its uses. It has revealed the fact that amongst Churchmen themselves there exists an unanimity on this subject, irrespective of political and even religious differences, which was wholly unsuspected; and it has fixed our minds more intently on the necessity of reforms in the Church. To this latter point I purpose devoting the remainder

of the time which is at my disposal. But it may be well to premise that, among the reforms which I contemplate, I do not include the breaking down of all doctrinal barriers for the sake of comprehension. A Church lives by the vitality and intensity of its faith; and, while I should wish to speak with due respect of the chief advocates of this general comprehension personally, I can only express my own opinion that such a Church, having no bond of union, must rapidly fall to pieces, and that it would perish unregretted, because it had done nothing worthy of a prolonged life.

1. *CHURCH PATRONAGE.*

In the forefront of all Church reforms stands the question of Patronage. It occupies this prominent position, not only from its own intrinsic importance, as involving indirectly other considerations of the highest moment, the sale of benefices, the checks on unfitness of presentees, and the like, but also because it has been more thoroughly discussed and is more nearly ripe for solution than others. In the session of 1884 two Church Patronage Bills were before the House of Commons, bearing the names of Mr. Leatham and Mr. Stanhope, and a Select Committee was appointed to report on the two. The Report, though it included some unworkable provisions, was most hopeful, because in the main it offered a reasonable solution, which (judging from the constitution of the Committee) might be expected to obtain general

support in the House. No action however was taken upon it before the session closed. Somewhat later however, the Archbishop of Canterbury with the assistance of the Bishops drew up a Draft Bill, which, so far as it traversed the same ground, went on much the same lines as the Parliamentary Report, but included other highly important provisions for the correction of irregularities and the prevention of unfit presentations. This Draft was submitted by the Archbishops to their respective Convocations. From the House of Laymen associated with the Southern Convocation and from the Lower House of the Northern Convocation it met with much adverse criticism. I will not stop to consider to what extent this criticism was deserved. It is sufficient to say that the Bill was remodelled in consequence, and that one main provision—inherited with modifications from the Parliamentary Report—which enabled the patron to sell to the Diocesan Board of Patronage on any vacancy, and charged the purchase money on the income of the living, spreading it over a long term of years, was entirely dropped, in deference to the opposition which it had aroused. The Bill thus remodelled was presented to the House of Lords by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and being favourably received was referred to a Select Committee of Peers. By this Committee it was thoroughly revised; but the revision, though important, touched rather the details than the principles of the Bill. Again however a political crisis interposed, followed by a dissolution,

and any further legislative action was prevented for the time.

I trust however that the postponement is only temporary. The breathing space has at all events given opportunity for due consideration. The Bill has undergone the scrutiny of many eyes ; and, if we may judge from what has happened, it has in its final form a fair chance of passing the legislature. I do not say that I consider it perfect. It does not go as far in some directions as I could have wished. The modifications which have been introduced in the successive revisions have not all in my opinion been improvements. Their justification in my eyes is that they have tended to make it more generally acceptable. Nevertheless I am persuaded that, if carried, it will remove nine tenths of the evils of the present system, while it will preserve all the advantages.

The Bill, as it stands amended, may be said to keep two main aims in view. It strives to prevent any transference of patronage which is either unseemly in itself or dangerous to the spiritual interests of the parish ; and it provides safeguards against the admission of an unfit presentee to a spiritual charge. Besides these two principal objects, it contains likewise some other miscellaneous provisions which are far from unimportant in their bearing on the administration of the Church.

Its chief constructive feature is the creation of a body called the 'Council of Presentations.' The

functions of this body will be twofold, corresponding to the two main aims of the Bill as already indicated—to control the transference of patronage, and to exercise a supervision as to persons presented to the Bishop for institution. It will be diocesan, and will be so constituted as to represent the mind of Churchmen in the Diocese. In Durham it will be composed of five lay and five clerical members besides the Bishop. The lay members will be the Chancellor of the Diocese, and two laymen elected from each Archdeaconry; the clerical members will be the two Archdeacons, one elected representative of each Archdeaconry, and one elected representative of the Dean and Chapter, which will include for this purpose the Honorary Canons. As the Bill gives considerable discretionary powers to the Bishop, it is important that he should not exercise these powers alone. The responsibility therefore will be shared by the Council, on whose report he will act in certain prescribed cases. This association in the responsibility is intended at once as a safeguard to the patron and the presentee against any arbitrary action on the part of the Bishop, and a protection to the Bishop himself against the odium which would attach to his single action in matters involving so grave interests. The mode of electing the clerical representatives is obvious and can scarcely give rise to much criticism. The provisions for the election of the lay representatives are probably as little open to objection as any which could be devised. I refer only

to the main regulations; for in the details they seem unnecessarily cumbersome, and some revision will probably be needed in consequence. The vestry, or the body (whichever it may be) in each parish, which at present elects the Churchwarden or Churchwardens, is to elect a representative. The representatives of all the parishes in the Archdeaconry thus chosen form a body of electors themselves, and they appoint the two lay members of the Council for that Archdeaconry. It is likewise provided that every member of the body of electors and every elected member of the Council shall, before exercising their respective functions, declare themselves in writing to be members of the Church of England. Thus the popular character of the representation is preserved, while the interests of the Church are safeguarded.

Of the two main purposes, which I mentioned as contemplated in the Bill, the transference and alienation of patronage stands first. Here we must remember that we have to deal with an existing state of things, which was not of our own creating. The possession of patronage is not only a trust, but it is a right, a privilege also. In most cases this right cost the possessor money in the first instance, either as a donor or as a purchaser; in all it has a money value now. This state of things, whatever may be the objections to it, has grown up not only under the tacit protection, but with the express recognition, of the law. But we may lay it down as a moral axiom that we are not permitted to do evil that good may come. The

Church at all events cannot expect a blessing, if she should base a reform, however necessary, on wholesale confiscation. But all schemes hitherto suggested for buying out patrons wholesale have failed at one point or another. The proposal of the Commons Committee, that Queen Anne's Bounty should purchase at any moment from all patrons who desired to sell, was based on a misapprehension of the financial powers of the Bounty. It imposed on it a pecuniary liability which it had no means of meeting. The Draft Bill of the Bishops avoided this defect. It was open however to two other objections, one of expediency, the other (professedly) of principle. As a matter of expediency, it was urged that a great injury would be done to parishes where the Clergyman's income was small, by charging on it the repayment of a very large percentage for a long term of years in order to buy out the patron. As a question of principle, it was maintained that it was an immoral thing to divert money which was given for providing spiritual ministrations in a parish to enrich the pocket of the patron. I confess I am quite unable to follow this last objection. The money was given in the first instance for the spiritual welfare of the parish; and if this spiritual welfare is best served in the long run by assigning a portion of it to dealing with the patronage, it is difficult to see what principle is infringed. The parish is on this supposition a gainer by the transaction; and what is the objection, if the patron incidentally gains also? Only those who

would object on moral grounds, and under any circumstances whatever, to recognize an advowson as having a pecuniary value, and therefore as claiming compensation, are consistent, so far as I can see, in regarding such a transaction as an infringement of principle; but this was not the class of persons who did urge the objection in this form. Altogether it resolves itself in my eyes into a question of expediency, meaning by expediency the consideration of the spiritual interests of the parish in the highest and widest sense. From the point of view of expediency, it is impossible not to sympathise with the objection to the diminution of clerical incomes, already in many cases too narrow; but I should have been prepared, for the sake of the larger good, to face this temporary inconvenience, and to have met it with temporary expedients, where it pressed hardly. I need not however discuss this point any further. The scheme met with too serious opposition to have any chance of success, as it then stood; and we should do wisely to confine ourselves to the practicable.

But patronage, if it is a right, is a trust also; and where the two conflict, the right must give way to the trust. While therefore we are not justified in depriving a patron of his right without proper compensation, we are not only permitted but we are bound to create such safe-guards as will secure that this trust is not violated, even though some restriction be thus imposed on the patron's freedom of action. If the right is exercised, it must be exercised in

favour of fit persons ; if it is transferred, it must be transferred into proper hands and in a seemly way. In either case no scandal or detriment to the Church must be permitted. A violation of the trust is an abuse of the right ; and no quarter should be given to abuses. Here then is a sacred principle. Along with the recognition of the right, there must be the safe-guarding of the trust.

A recognition of both these principles underlies the proposed legislation. While the Bill recognises the right of the patron, it puts wholesome and effective checks on its exercise, whether in the transference or in the bestowal of his patronage. The two are not indeed unconnected the one with the other ; for the abuse in the transference has led to the abuse in the exercise, and conversely. But as regards the safe-guards, it will be convenient to consider them separately.

The main sources of the scandals connected with the transference of patronage by sale hitherto have been threefold—donatives, resignation bonds, and next presentations. The Bill abolishes donatives ; it makes resignation bonds illegal ; and it forbids the sale of next presentations altogether. It moreover restricts the purchasers to three classes. They must be either public patrons, who, having no right of sale, can have no pecuniary or sordid motive in the purchase ; or they must be parishioners possessing a substantial property in the parish and therefore presumably having a direct interest in its spiritual

welfare; or, if they belong to neither of these categories, they must be persons approved as fit by the Council of Presentations. I could have wished that the property qualification had been made higher, and that this second class likewise had been subject to the approval of the Council of Presentations, and I think the third class might have been dispensed with altogether. But, as it is, the restrictions and qualifications must, so far as I can see, entirely abolish the immoral traffic in livings. As a further safe-guard, no sale is permitted to persons who can be shown to be engaged in negotiating sales and exchanges; the Council of Presentations can demand to see the deeds and contracts of sale before giving approval; and lastly, every sale or transfer of patronage must be registered in the Diocesan Office, where very stringent declarations are required to be made by the vendor and the purchaser. This provision of registration may seem trifling, but it is really very important. At the present moment, the contract is conducted privately, and even the Bishop may be left in ignorance that the patronage has changed hands until a vacancy reveals the fact. Again; we have had quite recently the scandal—for grave scandal it was—of representatives of two parties in the Church bidding against each other for the advowson of a living. The dishonour done to the Church here was not the less, because the competing parties themselves were influenced by higher motives than mere sordid gain. A recurrence of such a

scandal is rendered impossible. Sale by auction is strictly forbidden.

But even more important than the restrictions on the transference of patronage are the restrictions on the exercise of it, as provided by the Bill. In the existing state of things the Bishop is powerless to refuse institution to a presentee, unless he has laid himself open to moral or doctrinal charges which a law-court would sustain. Even in this case the Bishop's refusal exposes him to vexatious and very costly law proceedings. But the presentee may be burdened with debt, which would be a fatal bar to his influence, or he may have some mental or physical infirmity which would render him useless or almost useless in the particular parish, or he may be disqualified in some other way. Yet there is no redress in the present state of the law. The Archbishop's Bill provides a remedy for this state of things. The Council here steps in, investigates the case, and advises the Bishop whether the objection is valid or not. At this point the parishioners are entitled to be heard. A whole month's notice is to be given to the parish before institution. Any parishioners may submit their objections in writing to the Bishop, and he may, if he thinks fit, refer them to the Council. If the Council reports against the presentee, the Bishop may refuse institution. This is a new, and a highly important safeguard. Though many would consider that the parishioners are not the best body to appoint their own clergyman, there are few who

would wish to withhold from them this opportunity of representation.

There are other provisions in the Bill, not directly affecting the transference or exercise of patronage, but most valuable in themselves, more especially those affecting the sequestration of a benefice and the lunacy of an incumbent—both extremely difficult cases to deal with in the present unsatisfactory state of the law.

I believe that by this statement I have justified my sanguine presentiment as to the beneficial effects of the Bill in removing present evils, if it becomes law. But I said likewise, that all the advantages of the present system would be preserved. In saying this, I had primarily in my mind the variety of patronage. To this cause, I venture to think, is very largely to be attributed the fact that, notwithstanding all the anomalies and grave defects of the present system, the clergy of the Church of England will compare favourably with the clergy of any other Church, and that they have so strong a hold on the mind of the people. More especially I desire to recognize the value of lay patronage. A lay patron is more free in his choice than an ecclesiastical patron. The Bishop for instance is rightly expected in his appointments to consider chiefly the clergy who are working in his Diocese. The lay patron is bound by no such fetters of public opinion. Complaints were at one time brought against my predecessor that he promoted clergy too freely from without. Yet

statistics showed that he had exercised this discretion incomparably more sparingly than the lay patrons in the Diocese. While I reserve to myself perfect liberty to appoint from without, whenever occasion may serve, yet during my whole episcopate hitherto, though I have made 44 appointments to parochial charges in my own gift, I have not more than once exercised this liberty in such appointments. This one exception was not in the present Diocese of Durham, and on that occasion I acted upon the representations of the chief parishioners and appointed one who was favourably known to them as having officiated in the parish. Yet obviously it is desirable that new blood should be introduced from time to time, and it is chiefly through the lay patrons that this can be done. No doubt lay patronage hitherto has been responsible for some of the very worst appointments, as well as some of the very best. But the provisions of the Bill tend to prevent the former, without interfering with the latter.

One other point deserves to be mentioned, and I have done with this subject. The Council of Presentations is likewise a Board of Patronage. In other words it is empowered to hold advowsons. Now I know that many persons object to this form of patronage. I so far agree with this objection as to hold that as a rule, while the safest appointments are made by boards, the best are made by individuals. But I believe that this will be the best form of board, comparatively free from the stiffness and the party

prejudice which are the drawbacks of boards. Moreover there will be no undue tendency in the patronage to gravitate towards this board. It will start without any patronage. It can only obtain such by gift or by purchase. But it will have no money to begin with. If therefore either advowsons are given to it or money is placed in its hands by which it can purchase advowsons, this will come to pass because it wins confidence, and presumably therefore because it deserves confidence.

2. CHURCH REVENUES.

Another subject which is highly important in itself and has attracted recent attention is the question of Church Finance. Can the revenues of the Church be turned to a better account by any scheme of redistribution or taxation or otherwise, which is just in itself and pays proper regard to local rights? It will be seen from the way in which I have limited the question, that I do not contemplate any wholesale procedure, such as putting the collective revenues of the Church into the crucible, and re-distributing them after fusion in equal portions to the several incumbencies. I believe that this course would be disastrous as a policy. But it would be open to a still graver charge. It would be morally wrong. The endowment, whether ancient or of recent date, was given originally for the particular parish; and, until adequate provision is made for the spiritual wants of that parish, it is unjust that it should be muled for

the benefit of its neighbours however needy. When this point however has been reached, when owing to an unexpected increase in the value of property, which the donor could not have foreseen, the endowments exceed, not a mere minimum which will keep the parish from absolute spiritual starvation, but a substantial competency, then it seems to me equitable, as it is certainly politic, that other districts—more especially neighbouring districts—should benefit from its superfluous resources.

It is natural that you should expect me to say something here about episcopal revenues, and I intend to speak quite frankly. Indeed I have no motive to do otherwise. A scheme was more or less definitely formulated a few weeks ago by the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, which has been received apparently with favour and which I may conveniently take as my starting point. He proposes that the episcopal incomes shall be taxed, and that the money thus raised shall be devoted to founding several additional sees. I trust that this proposal will receive the consideration which it deserves. The object is excellent; for recent experience has shown that no money fructifies more rapidly than the expenditure in providing more effective episcopal supervision. It is only necessary to look at the huge and populous Dioceses of Manchester or of Worcester for illustration of the need of further division. The wider functions of the Archbishops also may well claim for them some relief from the

charge of Dioceses which with their present area are alone sufficient to tax to the utmost the energies of one man. Nor does it seem to me that there is any objection in principle to the suggested mode of providing the revenues. There is nothing sacred in the present amount of episcopal incomes. It cannot even plead antiquity. It is a readjustment barely half a century old, when by a redistribution the more wealthy bishoprics were diminished and the poorly endowed increased from the resources thus saved. The proposal however has a corollary, on which I desire to say a few words. The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol suggests that the episcopal incomes which have already contributed to the formation of new sees should be taxed at a lower rate. To this part of his proposal I would offer an amendment. Speaking for Durham, I should be quite willing that the episcopal income of myself and my successors should be taxed on the same scale as the others; but I think that the money thus raised may fairly be devoted to home purposes. Not only are enormous sums dispensed annually from the original revenues of the See of Durham through the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for the needs of the Church outside, not only has a very large percentage in addition—one-eighth of the whole—been charged on the reduced revenue of the Bishop, but the people, the clergy and laity, have contributed munificently to the foundation of a new see; and it seems to me therefore that any further deductions from the

episcopal income ought to be made for the benefit of the Church in the Diocese. A proposal for instance to tax the See of Durham for the increase of the poorer incumbencies in the patronage of the Bishop would seem to me to be very legitimate in itself and would receive my most cordial support. As I consider myself to hold my large official income in trust for the benefit of the Diocese, neither I myself personally nor my heirs would be the sufferers. I should be deprived to the same extent of the power of contributing to diocesan purposes, while the Diocese, which now gets the money in one way, would then get it in another. And here may I add a word about certain statistics of episcopal wealth which have been recently paraded. We here happen to know something about the one person who is credited with the highest amount on the list in more recent years. It is a cruel injustice to the memory of my predecessor to entertain the thought for a moment that he was influenced by a love of money. His boundless generosity was proverbial in this Diocese, and I see traces of it everywhere. His large private fortune has been in all ways an untold gain to the Diocese. Whether rightly or wrongly, many a man thinks that he has no right to impair a fortune which he has inherited, that he has only the usufruct of it, and that he is bound to hand it down to his heirs intact. I do not say that this is true under all circumstances; I am very far from thinking so; but I suspect that he would

have the great majority of honourable men on his side. But while I am on this subject, I would ask one general question. Is it right or is it wrong, intrinsically—I speak from a Christian point of view—to possess a large fortune? I am not considering now the case of a clergyman amassing great wealth from his clerical income, which no one would defend. I do not say whether it is wrong or not; but if it is wrong, it must be wrong for the layman not less than for the clergyman. Let us be consistent. The clergyman who commits the wrong is the more blameable, because he is the teacher and should enforce the lesson by example. But the lesson itself must be the same for both. The layman in this respect is the successor of the fishermen and the tent-maker neither more nor less than the clergyman.

From what I have said, it will be clear that I would gladly see some general scheme, whether by taxation or in some other way, which would lead to a reduction in the present episcopal incomes. To what extent this reduction may wisely be carried is another matter. Whether it would be economical in the end to diminish episcopal incomes so far that the Bishops could no longer set a standard of liberality, which would act as a stimulus to laymen, I am very far from sure. There are other considerations too which must not be kept out of sight. A Bishop ought to be in a position to entertain large clerical and other gatherings and to house the candidates at

the time of Ordination, not to mention other purposes which require both money and space. This affects the question of episcopal residences. It may be well that the Bishops should be in many cases less expensively housed; but here again reform may be carried too far. A large house enables them to do many things conducive to the efficient administration of the Diocese. I speak from experience. Moreover in some cases their residences have a high historical value. The Bishop's Manor House at Auckland is a notable example of this. It is, I believe, the oldest of episcopal residences. It has been connected with the Bishops of Durham from the time of the Conquest. It is associated with all the noblest memories of the See before and since the Reformation. It is still fresh with the impress of Cosin and of Butler. Its Chapel is the most stately of episcopal Chapels, and it has been the joy and pride of the present occupant of the See to render the internal decorations worthy of the noble structure which he has inherited. To part with Auckland Castle would be to break with history. To sever Auckland Chapel from the uses of the Church would be an irreparable wrong.

Let me turn now to parochial incumbencies. Here again, though there is room for reform, I should deprecate the extravagant schemes of levelling which find favour in some quarters. All experience teaches that it would be highly inexpedient to cut down the income of the Rector or Vicar of the mother Church in a large town to the level of an average incumbency.

Wherever an exceptional position of this kind is slenderly endowed, the Church suffers appreciably by the poverty of the endowment. No one can afford to accept it unless he has some private fortune ; no one is able to maintain the position properly unless he has very considerable means. Yet the clergy of the town need a head. Then again it is surely not an unreasonable thing that there should be means of rewarding long or exceptional services, even in the Christian ministry, by something more than a meagre competency. But granting this, much may still be done. In this Diocese two Acts of Parliament—the Bishopwearmouth Rectory Act, and the Stanhope and Wolsingham Rectories Act—many years ago set an example, which has been followed more than once since, and may still be followed with advantage. At Bishopwearmouth a large number of incumbencies was carved out of the mother parish and endowed from the revenues of the Rectory. The growing population of the borough of Sunderland needs all and more than all the old endowments of the Bishopwearmouth Rectory to supply its spiritual wants. But in the case of Stanhope and Wolsingham the Act provides that after the needs of these places are duly supplied by the formation of new districts or otherwise, the residue of the resources shall be available for other parts of the Diocese. This same principle of redistribution has been put in practice more recently elsewhere. Within the last year or two arrangements have been made or are in progress, by which not less

than five of the most highly endowed benefices in this Diocese in the patronage of the Bishop have parted, or will part, with a very appreciable fraction of their endowments for the benefit of their poorer neighbours. I am bound to say that my suggestions have been cheerfully met by the incumbents of these benefices, even where they involved immediate personal sacrifices. As occasion serves, I shall hope to extend the operation of this principle.

But there is another method which has been suggested to remedy the great inequalities of clerical incomes. All livings above a certain amount might be taxed to create a fund for supplying the needs of the poorly endowed benefices. To produce anything like an adequate sum it would probably be necessary to have a graduated scale of taxation. To this I can see no valid objection. On the contrary it would seem to be highly reasonable. I am well aware that strong objections are urged against a graduated property or income tax. Whether these objections be valid or not, I need not stop to enquire, for I contend that there is no analogy whatever between the two cases. Two reasons, and two only of any force, so far as I am aware, are urged against the graduated income or property tax; and neither applies in this case. In the first place it is urged, that by taxing large incomes highly the accumulation of capital is discouraged, and thus an injury is done to the wealth of the country. But clerical incomes cannot be employed so as to influence the production

of wealth. Again a second and very formidable objection is the fact that, whereas the chief payers of the tax would be the wealthy few, the imposers of the tax are ultimately the whole body of electors, the impecunious many; so that, if the precedent of a graduated taxation were once allowed, the temptation to press more and more hardly on large incomes could hardly be resisted. Here again there is no similarity between the two cases. The imposers of the tax would presumably be the Houses of Convocation, and in these the clergy of superior means are more than adequately represented.

I have indicated some means by which a re-adjustment might be effected, which would redress the most painful inequalities without doing violence to legitimate principles. The intervention of Parliament might be needed, but no sweeping legislation would be called for.

3. *ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS.*

There is another question of Church Reform, which cannot be passed over altogether in silence. I refer to the constitution of Ecclesiastical Courts. If I content myself with a few brief remarks on this point, it is not because I do not consider the subject of primary importance, but because it may be regarded for the moment as in abeyance. When I delivered my Charge four years ago, the Commission was still sitting; and the hope was then expressed that it might lead to the reconstitution of our courts

on a basis which would command the confidence of all who are directly concerned. The Report has since appeared. It was issued with the signatures of a much larger proportion of the Commissioners than might have been anticipated, considering the composition of the Commission and the controversial matter with which it dealt. It was favourably received, if I rightly interpret public opinion, by the large body of the clergy and laity, and would probably have been accepted by many more as a legitimate compromise terminating a painful period of disturbance and suspense. But in all such cases the voices of the contents are only feebly heard, while the cry of the not contents rings sharply and loudly. It was severely attacked from two opposite quarters. From the one side the Bishop's veto was vigorously assailed, as a device for defeating the ends of justice. Yet under the two existing modes of procedure, the Clergy Discipline Act and the Public Worship Regulation Act, a veto is accorded to the Bishop; and this power of interposition has been more than once exercised beneficially in the maintenance of the peace of the Church. From the other side the proposed Final Court of Appeal was not less severely handled, as if the secular power were therein constituted the supreme judge of heresy. Yet against this interpretation the Report carefully guards itself in its recommendations; and meanwhile it seemed to be forgotten by assailants that, wherever property is involved, the very idea of the State requires that the

State must have the last word. In this cross fire the Report of the Commission stood but little chance, and it was not thought prudent to press for immediate legislation. This result was perhaps inevitable, but it is deeply to be deplored. Let us hope that longer reflexion may lead to a calmer and more favourable judgment.

4. *THE CHURCH HOUSE.*

Before I close, I desire to recommend one other matter to your attention. The Church of England is at present without any central home. Almost every other great Christian community has such a local centre, whither all its diverse activities and interests converge, as to their natural meeting-point. It would be a great advantage to the Church of England to possess such a house. It is a reproach to her that this want has been so long unsupplied. The jubilee is fast approaching of a reign which will be memorable for ever in our national history, and which has witnessed a development of manifold energy and life in our English Church almost, if not wholly, without a parallel in the previous centuries. What memorial more appropriate than the erection of such a building as a thank-offering of English Churchmen for the signal blessings which this reign has brought alike to the nation and the Church? I am quite aware that alternative schemes have been suggested—schemes admirable in themselves, but hardly appropriate to the occasion. We need some visible memorial which

will attract the eye and appeal to the imagination of future ages. But I did not broach this subject with any intention of discussing rival plans. I would only submit, that all true Churchmen, whatever may have been their preference in the first instance, should join heartily in the promotion of this object, that a memorial may be raised which shall be worthy alike of the signal event which it commemorates and of the great Church in whose name it is reared. There are many among us—I confess that I am one—who yearn for the time when the Church of England as a whole shall possess a general representative assembly. The erection of this building will be a fit prelude, as we trust it may prove an unerring augury, of such a Convocation of the Church.

Final.

I would gladly have said a few words on other matters of real moment for the effective administration of the Church, such as Superannuation Pensions and Clerical Life Assurance; but it is time to bring this address to a close. What has been the true spiritual growth of the Diocese during these four years, only the last day will reveal. I have been able to lay before you merely the external signs, more or less deceptive, of progress. But surely this record, inadequate as it is, must suggest to us a twofold lesson, of encouragement and of humiliation—of encouragement that the tide of Church work in our day has been steadily and visibly rising—of

humiliation that God has crowned our feeble efforts with blessings so disproportionate to their deserving. May He so endow you all with the spirit of self-devotion and love and with the power of a blameless life, that at the great and final Visitation you may present yourselves fearlessly and joyfully before the throne of Grace, there to give an account of your stewardship and ministry.



NOTES.

NOTE 1, p. 10, l. 18.

GRANTS FROM THE SPECIAL CHURCH BUILDING FUND TO
CHURCHES AND MISSION ROOMS, FROM FEB. 1884,
TO DEC. 31, 1886.

No.	NAME OF PLACE.	ACCOM- MODATION.	POPU- LATION.	GRANT.
				£
1	Deaf Hill (concluding expenses)	252	2000	100
2	S. Paul's, Stockton - - -	417	3876	500
3	S. Paul's, West Hartlepool - - -	755	6000	850
4	S. John's, Sunnycrow - - -	508	4200	600
5	All Saints', Eppleton - - -	820	5200	700
6	S. Paul's, Low Teams - - -	501	7800	600
7	S. John the Evangelist's, Dipton - - -	418	3300	600
8	S. Aidan's, Blackhill - - -	430	3800	500
9	All Saints', Harton - - -	322	2815	300
10	Ven. Bede's, Gateshead - - -	634	5000	250
11	S. Aidan's, Herrington - - -	540	3780	500
12	S. Jude's, South Shields - - -	615	5000	700
13	S. Matthew's, Newbottle - - -	568	6715	500
14	S. John's, Hebburn - - -	550	4800	500
15	S. Aidan's, South Shields (for site) - - -			150
16	S. Andrew's, Hartlepool - - -	218	5903	300
17	Mission Chapel, Pelton Fell - - -	222	3000	50
18	Seamen's Church, South Shields - - -	390		250
19	Mission Chapel, Felling - - -	550	7545	250
20	Do. S. Edmund's, Gateshead - - -	350	7795	100
21	Do. Waldrige Fell - - -	200	1400	100
22	Do. Bensham - - -	300	8000	150
23	Do. Trimdon - - -	194	2000	150
24	Do. Langley Park - - -	246	1600	150
25	Do. Stranton - - -	250	2655	75
26	Do. Haswell - - -	120	4200	80

Of the buildings included in this list, fifteen Churches and ten Mission Chapels or Rooms (including the Seamen's Mission Church, South Shields) have been either completed or are in course of erection.

The following summary shews the money raised from January, 1884, to January, 1887, together with other sums contributed locally for the Erection of Churches, aided by the Fund.

These last comprise grants by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, by Societies, and value of sites so far as could be ascertained.

SUMMARY.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Direct Subscriptions, Appropriated	23,232	17	0	} 40,395	10	0
Do. Unappropriated	17,162	13	0			
Offerteries - - Appropriated	87	14	8	} 652	9	7
Do. - - Unappropriated	564	14	11			
Local Contributions (Estimated)	-	-	-	-	25,000	0 0
Ecclesiastical Commissioners - - -	-	-	-	-	7,000	0 0
Other Societies - - - - -	-	-	-	-	2,000	0 0
Value of Sites (Estimated)	-	-	-	-	7,000	0 0
				<hr/>		
				£82,047	19	7
				<hr/> <hr/>		

There is reason to believe that the Local Contributions have been considerably larger than the estimate here given.

NOTE 2, p. 14, l. 11.

LIST OF CHURCHES CONSECRATED AND DISTRICTS FORMED
SINCE THE LAST VISITATION.

I. CHURCHES CONSECRATED :

Blackhill, S. Aidan's.
 Darlington, S. Luke's.
 Deaf Hill cum Langdale.
 Dipton, S. John the Evangelist's.
 Eastgate, All Saints'.
 Gateshead, Ven. Bede's.
 Hebburn, S. Oswald's.
 Herrington, S. Aidan's.
 Low Teams, S. Paul's.
 Newbottle, S. Matthew's.
 Sedgefield Asylum (Chapel).
 South Shields, S. Jude's.

Stockton, S. Paul's.
 Sunnyside, S. John's.
 Tudhoe Grange, S. Andrew's.
 Waterhouses, S. Paul's.
 West Hartlepool, S. Paul's.

2. DISTRICTS FORMED :

Eppleton.
 South Shields, S. Jude's.
 Dipton, S. John the Evangelist's.
 Blackhill, S. Aidan's.
 Tudhoe Grange, S. Andrew's.
 Herrington, S. Aidan's.
 Darlington, S. Luke's.
 Southwick, S. Columba's.
 Hebburn, S. John's.
 Gateshead, Ven. Bede's.
 South Shields, S. Aidan's.
 Eastgate, All Saints'.
 Greenside, S. John's.
 West Hartlepool, S. Paul's.

NOTE 3, p. 15, l. 5.

CEMETERIES AND ADDITIONAL CHURCHYARDS CONSECRATED
 SINCE THE LAST VISITATION.

Auckland, S. Andrew's.
 Brandon.
 Darlington, Addition to West Cemetery.
 Eldon, Churchyard.
 Ferryhill and Chilton Cemetery.
 Gateshead Fell.
 Greatham.
 Medomsley.
 Penshaw.
 Sadberge.
 Seaham Harbour Cemetery.
 Shildon.
 Shincliffe.
 Shotton.
 Silksworth.
 Southwick Cemetery.
 Stockton, Addition to Cemetery.
 Sunderland, Addition to Cemetery.
 Trimdon.

NOTE 4, p. 18, l. 29.

SUMMARY OF THE ORDINATIONS OF DEACONS DURING THE FOUR YEARS PRECEDING THE PRESENT VISITATION
(1883-6).

	1883.		1884.		1885.		1886.		TOTAL.	
	TRIN.	SEPT. ADV.	TRIN.	SEPT. ADV.	TRIN.	SEPT. ADV.	TRIN.	SEPT. ADV.		
Oxford	1	1	4	1	1	3	2	4	3	21
Cambridge	7	3	2	4	5	6	5	2	3	48
Dublin	1		1							2
Durham, B.A.		1		1	1	4				3
" L. Th. and Non-Graduates		1		1	1	2	3	4	1	17
Other Universities								1		1
Theological Colleges	1	2		1			1	1	1	14
Literates										1
		27		22		36			30	115

NOTE 5, p. 27, l. 21.

The following rules are reprinted from the report of the Lay Helpers' Association, published in the *Durham Diocesan Gazette*, Vol. 1, No. 2, Feb. 1887, where further information will be found.

LAY EVANGELISTS.

The Rules of the Body, as approved by the Bishop, are as follows :

1. That a body of Laymen be formed for the Deanery of for the purpose of taking, regularly or occasionally, Mission Room and Open-air Services, and such other Evangelistic Work as may be found advisable.

2. That a Committee, consisting of the Rural Dean (*ex-officio* Chairman), with an equal number of Clergy and Laity, elected annually by the Ruridecanal Conference, be empowered to take oversight and guidance of this body, and that all appointments be made through this Committee, and that any Bye-laws of such Committee receive the sanction of the Bishop.

3. That this body of Laymen be divided into two sections—(1) Evangelists ; (2) Probationers or Assistant Evangelists.

4. That any Communicant may by application, subject to the approval of the Committee, become a Probationer ; that during his probation he shall receive some special training, where possible, under the sanction of the Bishop, before admission to the office of Evangelist ; and that his duties be chiefly to assist the Evangelists.

5. That the Evangelists shall comprise men who are recommended by the Committee to the Bishop as fit and proper persons—(1) For the present, godly men wishing to undertake the office, who are communicants of the Church of England, and have worked as Lay Preachers for not less than two years, and are highly recommended ; (2) for the future, men who either (A) after twelve months' service as Probationers pass a definite examination, which has been approved by the Bishop, or (B) in special cases of long or exceptional service as Probationers, are recommended by the vote of at least two-thirds of the members of the Committee.

6. That every Evangelist be admitted to his office by the Bishop at a special service, at which a license, renewable on the recommendation of the Committee at the end of each year, be given him ;

and that the Evangelists and Probationers be recognised by the Bishop as a body of Lay Workers in connection with the Diocesan Lay Helpers' Association.

7. That all Incumbents desiring the services (either occasional or regular) of Evangelists be required to make application to the Committee.

8. That the Committee meet at least quarterly; and at each quarterly meeting draw up a plan and appoint to each Evangelist the services he is required to take during the quarter. Any Evangelist unable to keep his appointment must obtain an approved substitute.

9. That necessary expenses, authorised by the Committee and incurred by working this scheme, be defrayed from voluntary sources and by collections made in those parishes where help is given.

With reference to the training of the Evangelists, and testimonials necessary for their admission to the office, the Bishop has issued the following Memorandum :

- I. *Testimonials*—Together with recommendation of the Committee, satisfactory Testimonials from one Clergyman and two Laymen (being regular Communicants) to be submitted to the Bishop.
- II. *Examination*.—The Bishop to keep the Examination in his own hands, and to appoint Examiners from year to year.
 - Subjects (i) General knowledge of Holy Scripture.
 - (ii) General knowledge of the Prayer Book.
 - (iii) Special knowledge of the Nicene Creed and Church Catechism.

The Examiners shall also satisfy themselves as to the Candidate's belief in the main doctrines of Christianity as taught by the Church. Encouragement shall be given to the study of other subjects (*e.g.*, English Church History) besides those named above, whether by examination or in some other way.

The following is a plan of work carried out in the Deanery of Auckland during the first quarter. The abbreviations E and A stand for Evangelists and Assistant Evangelists respectively; and the numbers represent the different members of each order.

NOTE 6, p. 29, l. 3.

The following is a summary of the first year's work of the Church Army in S. John's Parish, Sunderland, as given by the Incumbent.

FROM NOV. 29, 1884, TO NOV. 28, 1885.

Total number of hours spent in open air work	-	-	-	340
(Processions, street preaching, and open air services.)				
Total number of hours spent in in-door work	-	-	-	820
			Total	- - 1,160
Number of hours spent by Captain in visiting	-	-	-	650
Number of visits made by Captain	-	-	-	3,000
(Exclusive of a large number by Soldiers themselves.)				
Moderate estimate of total attendance at Army services (exclusive of services in Church)	-	-	-	27,000 to 32,000
(This is really a good deal under the mark judging from the results of the last 2 months.)				

The Church Army Brass Band, 22 members and 20 instruments, play round the Parish at the head of the Army processions, 5 times in every week, and very many short addresses and testimonies are given by the Soldiers in the course of the work, both inside and outside—often 8 or 10 or more in the course of an evening.

The following is the present arrangement of the Army work, which is fully carried out every week.

Sunday.—7-30 a.m., Prayer meeting.

8 a.m., Holy Communion. (Last Sunday, 43. Sunday before, 52.)

10-15 a.m., Open air work.

10-50 a.m., Morning service.

2-30 p.m., Men's Bible class. Others besides Church Army attend, but it is a Church Army Bible class.

Women's Bible class. Church Army only.

Ragged Sunday school. Do.

5-45 p.m., Open air work.

6-30 p.m., Evening service. 24 Soldiers are told off in weekly divisions of 8 each (two Sundays off duty and one on duty) to keep order at the children's service held at the same hour.

8-15—9-30 p.m., Short open air and evangelistic meeting in the Mission Hall. Always well attended.

Monday.—Extended open air procession for an hour, with lanterns and portable pulpit. Temperance concert and speech. Chairman generally a public man. Average attendance upwards of 400. A very large number of pledges taken in the year.

Tuesday.—Vicar's instruction on the Prayer Book, Confirmation, Holy Communion, etc. Excellent attendance,

averaging the last 8 weeks from 130 to 150.
Open to congregation as well.

Wednesday.—Open air work and evangelistic meeting. This meeting, with the 8-15 Sunday evening meeting, much blessed with real results of those coming forward professing repentance and faith.

Thursday.—6 p.m., Children's procession and service. From 300 to 350 always present.

7 p.m., Church service.

8 p.m., Choir. Many Soldiers attend the practice to learn Church hymns and chants.

Friday.—Church Army meeting for Soldiers alone alternating with one open to others. Both are meetings for prayer and deepening of the spiritual life. Generally the smallest of the meetings in the week—from 50 to 70—but always earnest and helpful. Many testimonies given at this meeting.

Saturday.—Prayer meeting or social gathering. Sometimes we march in procession to the temperance meeting held in the Assembly Hall in Fawcett Street.

There was an enrolment service on Nov. 21st, when Canon Body enrolled 38 Soldiers.

The number of enrolled Soldiers is now 98; but the total from the beginning would be considerably larger, several having left the neighbourhood and others the town.

This is the total of those who actually wear the Red Cord as the Church Army badge. A great many more attend the meetings and are much in sympathy with the work, but have not yet decided to be enrolled. There are as well an increasing number of probationers, who will come on for the next enrolment.

There is a great spirit of earnestness in the Army, and I think the Parish cannot be too thankful for the introduction of its work. It is really good and true.

NOTE 7, p. 31, l. 20.

The statistics of the Confirmations during the last four years are as follows:

YEAR.	NO. OF CONFIRMATIONS.	MALES.	FEMALES.	TOTAL.
1883	38	2,208	2,962	5,170
1884	49	2,401	3,240	5,641
1885	40	2,341	3,220	5,561
1886	58	3,188	4,315	7,503

A comparison of the ages of those who were confirmed in the year 1886 presents the following result :

UNDER 15.		BETWEEN 15-20.		BETWEEN 20-30.		BETWEEN 30-40.		BETWEEN 40-50.	
M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.
392	507	1,928	2,529	339	554	232	315	142	165

BETWEEN 50-60.		BETWEEN 60-70.		ABOVE 70.		AGE NOT RECORDED.		TOTAL CONFIRMED.	
M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.
40	89	18	33	4	6	93	127	3,188	4,315

NOTE 8, p. 32, l. 23.

The following is a list of parishes in which more than £2,000 has been spent on building, enlargement, and restoration of Churches, Mission Chapels, Parsonage Houses, etc , since the last Visitation :

	£
1. Auckland, S. Andrew's	5,230
2. Benfieldside	3,200
3. Blackhill	3,500
4. Chester-le-Street	3,367
5. Collierley	2,147
6. Darlington, S. Luke's	2,268
7. Dipton	2,900
8. Felling	2,332
9. Gateshead, S. Cuthbert's	2,007
10. „ S. Paul's	3,954
11. „ Venerable Bede's	3,515
12. Gateshead Fell	2,814
13. Grindon	2,535
14. West Hartlepool, S. Paul's	7,510
15. Hebburn, S. Oswald's	4,575
16. Herrington	4,420
17. Hetton-le-Hole	2,090
18. Houghton-le-Spring	2,752

19.	Hunwick	-	-	-	-	2,054
20.	Jarrow Grange	-	-	-	-	8,640
21.	Newbottle	-	-	-	-	3,180
22.	Ryton	-	-	-	-	4,804
23.	Seaham Harbour	-	-	-	-	3,589
24.	South Shields, S. Hilda's	-	-	-	-	4,411
25.	„	Holy Trinity	-	-	-	2,152
26.	„	South Westoe	-	-	-	2,120
27.	„	S. Jude's	-	-	-	5,165
28.	Stockton, Holy Trinity	-	-	-	-	2,928
29.	„	S. Paul's	-	-	-	3,700
30.	„	S. Peter's	-	-	-	2,120
31.	Sunderland, S. John's	-	-	-	-	4,200
32.	Sunnybrow	-	-	-	-	3,000
33.	Towlaw	-	-	-	-	2,902
34.	Washington	-	-	-	-	2,171
35.	Wearmouth, S. Barnabas', Hendon	-	-	-	-	3,100
36.	„	S. Mark's, Millfield	-	-	-	2,730

NOTE 9, p. 36, l. 2.

At a meeting of the Conference Committee on Thursday, November 18th, 1886, the following resolutions were adopted :

1. The Diocesan Institutions to be aided by the Fund shall be those connected with the Church, the School, and the Ministry—that is, the Church Building Funds—General and Special ; the Education Board—General Purposes, Training Colleges, and Religious Inspection ; the Sons of the Clergy Society, the Clerical Insurance Fund, and Clergy Pensions Fund.

2. The General Fund for other Diocesan objects shall include provision for Mission Clergy, Lay Helpers, and Evangelists in pressing cases ; the Augmentation of small Benefices, and assistance in building Parsonage Houses in poor parishes ; the Diocesan Conference, and the Diocesan Gazette ; and shall meet the expense of any other Diocesan Work, at the discretion of the Committee.

3. The existing Institutions named in section 1 shall be governed and administered as at present. The Diocesan Fund Committee will not interfere with their work, but will receive subscriptions for them and, as occasion serves, make grants to them.

4. The Fund shall be governed and administered by the Bishop of Durham as President, with a Committee of not more than twelve persons (including a Secretary and three Treasurers), who shall be named by the Committee of the Diocesan Conference and hold office for four years.

5. The Diocesan Fund Committee shall present to the annual business meeting of the Conference a report with full statement of its funds. This report will include, with the consent of the Societies concerned, the reports of the Church Building, Education Board, and Clergy Funds; so that the work and funds of the Diocesan Institutions will be presented to the Diocese in a Combined Report.

6. The reports of other Institutions in the Diocese, which with the consent of the Bishop are called Diocesan, may, if it be wished by the Societies themselves, be given space in the Combined Report on payment of the proportional cost.

The following specimen of a subscription paper in accordance with the foregoing scheme was adopted:

NAME OF SUBSCRIBER.	GENERAL FUND TO BE APPROPRIATED BY THE COMMITTEE.	SPECIAL FUNDS APPROPRIATED BY SUBSCRIBER.								TOTAL SUBSCRIPTIONS.
		CHURCH BUILDING.		EDUCATION BOARD.			PROVISION FOR CLERGY.			
		CHURCH BUILDING FUND.	BISHOP'S SPECIAL FIVE YEARS' FUND.	GENERAL PURPOSES.	TRAINING COLLEGES.	RELIGIOUS INSPECTION.	SONS OF CLERGY.	INSURANCE FUND.	PENSIONS FUND.	
	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.
A. B.	300 0	50 0	50 0	10 0	10 0	10 0	10 0	10 0	50 0	500 0
C. D.	50 0	5 0	5 0	5 0	5 0	5 0	5 0	5 0	15 0	100 0
E. F.	5 0			1 0	10	1 10	1 0	1 0		10 0
G. H.	10						5	5		1 0
Collection in— Church.	20 0									20 0

Whitsunday has been appointed as Diocesan Sunday, on which it is desired that Collections (Morning and Evening) shall be made for this Fund in all Churches in the Diocese.

The following is a table of the incumbencies vacated either by resignation (R) or by death (D) during the four years which elapsed between the two last Visitations (1882—1886). Where no outgoing incumbent is named, the incumbency was created for the first time.

BENEFICE.	PREVIOUS INCUMBENT.	HOW VACATED.	SUCCESSOR.	FORMERLY.
1883.				
Whorlton V. ... S.	William Cumby ...	R	A. J. Williams ...	C. of S. Oswald's, Durham
Monkhesleden, ... S.				
John's V. ...	Wm. Mirrieles ...	D	Geo. Little ...	C. of Monkhesleden
Whitworth V. ...	E. A. Wilkinson ...	R	E. A. Wilkinson ...	V. of Tudhoe
Tudhoe V. ...	E. A. Wilkinson ...	R	S. McK. Thompson.	C. of Ryton
South Shields, S. Hil-				
da's V. ...	Thos. Hy. Chester ...	R	Johnson Baily ...	V. of S. Luke's, Pallion
Monkwearmouth V. ...	C. P. Miles ...	R	C. G. Hopkinson ...	V. of Alvanley
New Shildon, All				
Saints' V. ...	Thomas Cooper ...	R	Henry Greene ...	V. of S. Stephen's in Banks, Southport
Pallion, S. Luke's V. ...	Johnson Baily ...	R	W. B. Tremenhoe.	C. of Ayre's Quay, Sunderland
Middleton S. George R.	J. G. Richardson ...	R	John Groves... ..	C. of S. Barnabas', Leeds
Elton R. ...	Charles Marriott ...	R	Compton Reade ...	V. of Cassington
Bishopwearmouth R. ...	W. Cockin ...	R	Robt. Long ...	V. of S. Andrew's Auckland
Stanhope R. ...	Charles Clayton ...	D	V. W. Ryan (Bp.)...	R. of Middleham
Eppleton District ...			W. H. Illingworth ...	C. of West Rainton
Auckland S. Andrew's V	Robert Long... ..	R	G. R. Eden ...	Chaplain to Bp. of Durham
Rookhope V. ...	John Wagstaff ...	R	Jas. Johnson... ..	P. C. of Ch. Ch., Macclesfield

BENEFACT.	PREVIOUS INCUMBENT.	HOW VACATED.	SUCCESSOR.	FORMERLY.
1884.				
South Shields, S. Jude's District			W. J. Wingate ...	C. of Gateshead
Dipton, S. John the Evangelist's District			Richard Tuson ...	C. of Beamish
Winston R.	Thomas Speck ...	D	F. E. Sadgrove ...	V. of S. Mark's, Millfield
Trimdon V.	Geo. Sproston ...	D	E. C. Biggs ...	C. of Silksworth
Blackhill, S. Aidan's District			F. J. Storey ...	C. of Hartlepool
Millfield, S. Mark's V.	F. E. Sadgrove ...	R	W. P. Swaby ...	V. of Castletown
Durham, S. Giles' V. ...	J. G. Norton ...	R	R. J. Pearce ...	Professor of Mathematics at Durham University
Esh V.	Edmund Lee... ..	D	C. F. D. Hodge ...	V. of Haarer
Castletown V.	W. P. Swaby ...	R	C. R. Green ...	R. of Rokeby
Tudhoe Grange V. ...			Enos Fenton ...	C. of Tudhoe
Gateshead, S. Cuthbert's V.	John J. Day... ..	D	D. S. Guy ...	C. of S. Andrew's Auckland
Heighington V.	C. C. Chevallier ...	D	W. H. G. Stephens.	V. of S. John's, Darlington
Wimlaton R.	Henry Wardell ...	D	Arthur Jones ..	V. of S. John the Evangelist's, Walton

BENEFICE.	PREVIOUS INCUMBENT.	HOW VACATED.	SUCCESSOR.	FORMERLY.
1884.				
Wingate Grange V. ...	E. N. V. Boydell ...	D	Robt. Simpson ...	C. of All Saints', Monkwearmouth
Penshaw R. ...	J. H. Fox ...	D	James Moore ...	R. of Etherley
Denton V. ...	John Birkbeck ...	D	Wm. Apter ...	C. of Church Kirk
Darlington, S. Luke's V.			Wm. Peacock ..	C. of S. Paul's, Darlington
Herrington V. ...			T. F. Paterson ...	C. of Houghton-le-Spring
1885.				
Stranton V. ...	John Rudd ...	R	Jos. Bennett ...	C. of S. James', Doncaster
Fir Tree V. ...	John Mason ...	R	Richd. Howe ...	C. of Fir Tree
Southwick, S. Columba's District ...			W. B. Hornby ...	C. of S. Bartholomew's, Dover
Etherley R. ...	James Moore ...	R	Isaac W. Milner ...	V. of S. Paul's, Burnley
Shadforth R. ...	Thomas Thornton...	D	Jas. Henderson ...	V. of Aneroft
West Hartlepool, Christ Church V. ...	G. E. Palmer ...	D	H. E. Savage ...	V. of Pelton
Bearpark V. ...	A. K. B. Granville..	D	Thos. Callinan ...	C. of S. Margaret's, Durham

BENEFICE.	PREVIOUS INCUMBENT.	HOW VACATED.	SUCCESSOR.	FORMERLY.
1885.				
Hebburn, S. John's District	W. H. G. Stephens	R	Edwd. Johnston J. G. Richardson ...	C. of Whickham V. of Monk's Kirby
Darlington, S. John's V. Gateshead, Ven. Bede's District	Compton Reade John Dingle	R	Jas. McIntosh Geo. Jepson	C. of Hebburn C. of Stockton-on-Tees
Elton R.	Jas. Geo. Milner ...	D	F. W. Glyn	C. of S. Andrew's Auckland
Lanchester V.	C. R. Bird	D	H. J. Lovejoy F. G. J. Robinson...	C. of Hunslet, Leeds C. of Seaton Carew
Hamsterley V.	C. A. Bullick G. A. Ormsby	D	T. C. Mulholland ...	C. of S. James', West Hartlepool
Castle Eden V.	H. E. Savage J. P. Eden	R	G. D. Copeland ...	V. of S. Stephen's, Walworth Common
West Hartlepool, S. James' V.	D. R. Falconer ...	R	John Wilkins ...	C. of S. Martin's, Scarborough
West Rainton R.	D. R. Falconer ...	D	D. R. Falconer Henry Martin ...	V. of Stockton-on-Tees V. of S. John's, Sunderland
Pelton V.	W. L. Kay	D	W. R. Burnet ...	V. of S. Thomas', Bishopwear- mouth
Sedgefield R.	R. H. Gray	D	T. E. Espin	R. of Wallasey
Stockton-on-Tees V. ...				
Kelcoe V.				
Wolsingham R.				

BENEFICE.	PREVIOUS INCUMBENT.	HOW VACATED.	SUCCESSOR.	FORMERLY.
1885.				
Greatham Hospital ...	F. J. James ...	D	Richd. Waters ...	R. of Sunderland
Sunderland, S. John's V. ...	Henry Martin ...	R	J. W. Willink ...	C. of S. Andrew's Auckland
Sunderland R. ...	Richd. Waters ...	R	S. B. Smith ...	Principal of the Durham Training College for Masters
Rookhope V. ...	James Johnson ...	R	J. P. Shepperd ...	V. of S. Thomas', Preston
Long Newton R. ...	Jonathan Wilson ...	D	J. M. Chritchley ...	Principal of Chester Training College
Bishopwearmouth, S. ...	W. R. Burnet ...	R	E. G. H. Caswell ...	V. of Hunwick
Thomas' V. ...	W. E. Scott ...	R	H. J. Swallow ...	C. of Brancepeth
Hawthorn R. ...	E. G. H. Caswell ...	R	W. F. Cosgrave ...	C. of S. Barnabas', Middle Hendon
Hunwick V. ...	W. H. Illingworth ...	R	Robinson Hindle ...	C. of Ven. Bede, Monkwearmouth
Eppleton District ...	J. W. Milner ...	R	Lewis D. Evans ...	C. of S. Mary's, South Shields
South Shields, S. Aidan's District ...			W. E. Houldey ...	V. of S. John's, Newcastle
Etherley R. ...				
1886.				
Wolviston V. ...	Wm. Eade ...	D	E. L. Butcher ...	V. of Westoe
Eastgate, All Saints' V. ...			John Eddowes ...	V. of S. Jude's, Bradford

BENEFICE.	PREVIOUS INCUMBENT.	HOW VACATED.	SUCCESSOR.	FORMERLY.
1886.				
Westoe V. S.	E. L. Butcher ...	R	J. H. A. Simmins...	C. of S. Thomas', Bishopwearmouth
West Hartlepool, Paul's V.	A. J. Williams ...	R	F. L. Cope ...	C. of Stranton
Whorlton V.	John Ridley ...	D	Oswald Whaley ...	R. of Folksworth
Norton V.	David Bruce... ..	R	M. L. J. Mortimer..	V. of Trannere
Merrington V.	B. C. Kennicott ...	D	Richard Coulton ...	C. of Thornley, Tow Law
Greenstide, S. John's V. Monkwearmouth, All Saints' V.	James Henderson...	R	R. M. Nason ...	C. of Ryton
Shadforth R.	E. Cheese ...	D	A. A. Boddy... ..	C. of All Saints', Monkwearmouth
Haughton-le-Skerne R. Stockton, S. James' V. West Hartlepool, S. James' V.	Thos. Law ...	R	W. Hooper ...	Classical Lecturer at Durham University
Darlington, S. John's V. Westoe V.	T. C. Mulholland ...	R	Thos. Law ...	V. of S. James', Stockton
	J. G. Richardsen ...	D	T. C. Mulholland ...	V. of S. James', West Hartlepool
	J. H. A. Simmins...	D	F. N. Eden ...	C. of Norton
			A. Boot... ..	C. of S. Margaret's, Durham
			Jos. Morris ...	Mathematical Lecturer at Durham University

